

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

* * *

KARL D. BOLEN,

Plaintiff,

v.

LILIAN JOYCE SIFUENTES,

Defendant.

Case No. 3:14-cv-00547-MMD-WGC

ORDER ACCEPTING AND ADOPTING
REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF MAGISTRATE JUDGE
WILLIAM G. COBB

Before the Court is the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 3) ("R&R") relating to plaintiff's application to proceed *in forma pauperis* (dkt. no. 1) and *pro se* complaint (dkt. no. 1-1). No objection to the R&R has been filed.

This Court "may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the findings or recommendations made by the magistrate judge." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party timely objects to a magistrate judge's report and recommendation, then the court is required to "make a *de novo* determination of those portions of the [report and recommendation] to which objection is made." 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). Where a party fails to object, however, the court is not required to conduct "any review at all . . . of any issue that is not the subject of an objection." *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985). Indeed, the Ninth Circuit has recognized that a district court is not required to review a magistrate judge's report and recommendation where no objections have been filed. See *United States v. Reyna-Tapia*, 328 F.3d 1114 (9th Cir. 2003) (disregarding the standard of review employed by the district court when reviewing a report and recommendation to

1 which no objections were made); see also *Schmidt v. Johnstone*, 263 F. Supp. 2d 1219,
2 1226 (D. Ariz. 2003) (reading the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Reyna-Tapia* as adopting the
3 view that district courts are not required to review "any issue that is not the subject of an
4 objection."). Thus, if there is no objection to a magistrate judge's recommendation, then
5 the court may accept the recommendation without review. See, e.g., *Johnstone*, 263 F.
6 Supp. 2d at 1226 (accepting, without review, a magistrate judge's recommendation to
7 which no objection was filed).

8 Nevertheless, this Court finds it appropriate to engage in a *de novo* review to
9 determine whether to adopt Magistrate Judge Cobb's R&R. Upon reviewing the R&R
10 and Plaintiff's complaint, this Court finds good cause to accept and adopt the Magistrate
11 Judge's R&R in full.


12 It is therefore ordered, adjudged and decreed that the Report and
13 Recommendation of Magistrate Judge William G. Cobb (dkt. no. 3) be accepted and
14 adopted in its entirety.

15 It is ordered that plaintiff's application to proceed *in form pauperis* (dkt. no. 1)
16 without having to prepay the full filing fee is granted; plaintiff shall not be required to pay
17 an initial installment fee. Plaintiff is permitted to maintain this action to conclusion without
18 the necessity of prepayment of fees or costs or the giving of security therefor. This order
19 granting *in forma pauperis* status shall not extend to the issuance of subpoenas at
20 government expense.

21 It is further ordered that the Clerk shall detach and file the complaint (dkt. no. 1-1).

22 It is further ordered that the complaint be dismissed with prejudice.

23 DATED THIS 31st day of December 2014.

24
25 
26 MIRANDA M. DU
27 UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
28